International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001488

A CLASSIFICATION OF SUBJECT MATTER Int.Cl C22C5/04, C23C14/34, C25C5/02

According to International Patent Classification (IPC) or to both national classification and IPC

B. FIELDS SEARCHED

Minimum documentation searched (classification system followed by classification symbols)
Int.Cl⁷ C22C5/04, C23C14/34, C25C5/02

1110:01 02203/04, 023014/34, 02303/02

Documentation searched other than minimum documentation to the extent that such documents are included in the fields searched

"Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1922-1996" Jütsuyo Shinan Toroku Koho 1971-2005

Kokai Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1971-2005

Toroku Jitsuyo Shinan Koho 1994-2005

Electronic data base consulted during the international search (name of data base and, where practicable, search (erms used)

C. DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT

Category*	Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages	Relevant to claim No. 1,3-6 7
X A	JP 2001-20065 A (Hitachi Metals, Ltd.), 23 January, 2001 (23.01.01), Claims; Par. Nos. [0001], [0019], [0023], [0030], [0031], [0038], [0040], [0044], [0045], 4 US 6589311 B1 & US 6676728 B2 4 EP 1066899 A2	
X Y A	JP 2000-178721 A (Mitsubishi Materials Corp.), 27 June, 2000 (27.06.00), Par. Nos. [0002] to [0005] (Family: none)	1,4,6 3 7
У	JP 2002-167668 A (Toshiba Corp.), 11 June, 2002 (11.06.02), Par. Nos. [0006] to [0008] (Family: none)	3

X	Further documents are listed in the continuation of Box C		See patent family annex.
'A"	Special categories of cited documents: document defining the general state of the art which is not considered to be of particular relevance	-T"	later document published after the international filing date or priority date and not in conflict with the application but cited to understand the principle or theory underlying the invention
ъ°.	earlier application or patent but published on or after the international filing date document which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is	"X"	document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered novel or cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is taken alone

- occurrent which may throw doubts on priority claim(s) or which is cited to establish the publication date of another citation or other special reason (as specified)

 "Y"
 document of particular relevance; the claimed invention cannot be considered to involve an inventive step when the document is
- "O' document referring to an oral disclosure, use, exhibition or other means
 of comment published poor to the international filing date but later than the
 promy date claimed
 "E' document published poor to the international filing date but later than the
 promy date claimed
 "E' document member of the same patient flamily
- Date of the actual completion of the international search

 Date of mailing of the international search report

09 May, 2005 (09.05.05) 24 May, 2005 (24.05.05)

Name and mailus address of the ISA/ Authorized officer

Japanese Patent Office

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001488 C (Continuation). DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED TO BE RELEVANT Category* Citation of document, with indication, where appropriate, of the relevant passages Relevant to claim No. JP 2002-105631 A (Sumitomo Metal Mining Co., Ltd.), 10 April, 2002 (10.04.02), Claims (Family: none)

International application No. PCT/JP2005/001488

Box No. II Observations where certain claims were found unsearchable (Continuation of iter	m 2 of first sheet)
This international search report has not been established in respect of certain claims under Article 17(2)(a) 1. Claims Nos.: because they relate to subject matter not required to be searched by this Authority, namely: .) for the following reasons:
Claims Nos.: because they relate to parts of the international application that do not comply with the prescribe extent that no meaningful international search can be carried out, specifically:	d requirements to such an
Claims Nos.: because they are dependent claims and are not drafted in accordance with the second and third.	sentences of Rule 6.4(a).
Box No. III Observations where unity of invention is lacking (Continuation of item 3 of first s	heet)
This International Searching Authority found multiple inventions in this international application, as fol (See extra sheet.)	
As all required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this international search claims. As all searchable claims could be searched without effort justifying an additional fee, this Authority any additional fee. As only some of the required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant, this internal only those claims for which fees were paid, specifically claims Nos.:	did not invite payment of
No required additional search fees were timely paid by the applicant. Consequently, this interestricted to the invention first mentioned in the claims; it is covered by claims Nos.: 1 an	
Remark on Protest The additional search fees were accompanied by the applicant's pro No protest accompanied the payment of additional search fees.	otest.

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/001488

Continuation of Box No.III of continuation of first sheet(2)

In order for a group of inventions claimed in claims to satisfy the requirement of unity of invention, there must be "special technical features" for linking the group of inventions so as to form a single general inventive concept.

In this connection, whether the technical matter common to claims 1 and 2 "Al-containing high-purity Ru powder" can be "special technical features" will be studied. A high-purity Ru raw material powder wherein the content of each of aluminum, etc. is ≤1 ppm is described in the prior art reference JP 2000-178721 A (Mitsubishi Materials Corp.) 27 June, 2000 (27.06.00), Par. No. [0005]. Thus, the above common matter is not a novel feature and consequently cannot be "special technical features". Further, as a high-purity Ru raw material powder wherein the content of each of alkali metals and aluminum is ≤1 ppm is described in the JP 2000-178721 A, it can be stated that the invention of claim 1 per se lacks novelty.

Consequently, there exist no "special technical features" for linking the group of inventions claimed in claims 1-7 so as to form a single general inventive concept. Therefore, it is apparent that the requirement of unity of invention is not satisfied.

Now, the number of groups of inventions linked with each other so as to form a general inventive concept, claimed in the claims of this international application will be studied.

It appears that there are described at least two inventions grouped into:

·Claim 1 and parts of claims 3 to 7 quoting claim 1, and

·Claim 2 and parts of claims 3 to 7 quoting claim 2.